

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In light of the above amendments and remarks to follow, entry of this amendment and reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 52, 58, 63 and 72 have been amended. Claims 52, 58-67 and 72 are pending in this application.

The Examiner rejected independent claims 52, 58, 63 and 72 as being obvious over a combination of Akamatsu, Sparks, Ohara and Hashimoto. Also, the Examiner rejected dependent claims 59-62 and 64-67 as being obvious over the combination of Akamatsu, Sparks, Ohara and Hashimoto. In addition, the Examiner rejected dependent claims 61 and 66 as being obvious over a combination of Akamatsu, Sparks, Ohara, Hashimoto and Yuen, and dependent claims 62 and 67 as being obvious over a combination of Akamatsu, Sparks, Ohara, Hashimoto, Yuen and Suga.<sup>1</sup>

The present claims, as amended, now recite "a decoding capability circuit for determining whether a digital signal of the program recorded on the recording medium reproduced by said reproducing apparatus and received through said digital interface is decodable by said decoder." (Independent claims 52, 58 and 63; independent claim 72 contains a similar limitation.) As discussed in the application, a determination is made whether a digital signal of an already recorded program on a recording medium loaded in the reproducing apparatus, where the digital signal of the recorded program is reproduced by the reproducing apparatus, can be decoded by a decoder of a

---

<sup>1</sup> It is noted that the Examiner identified Ohara as forming a basis for the obviousness rejections of the pending claims, but nowhere is Ohara applied with respect to the limitations of any of the claims. As such, the response to the obviousness rejection of the claims does not address Ohara.

receiving apparatus, and where the result of such determination is that the digital signal reproduced by the reproducing apparatus cannot be decoded by the decoder, a message is displayed showing that the program recorded on the recording medium is recorded such that the reproduced digital signal cannot be decoded. Based on the display of a message indicating that the digital signal of the recorded program reproduced by the reproducing apparatus and received through the digital interface "cannot be decoded" by the decoder, the user can recognize that, for example, a recording mode or streaming format of the digital signal is the reason why the digital signal cannot be decoded, and, therefore, take an appropriate action. (See specification, for example, at pp. 53-54). Consequently, the user is notified, by display of such message, to prevent user confusion when, for example, a tape cassette of a different transport stream specification or a digital video signal of a system other than a standard compression format has been loaded into the reproducing apparatus and is reproduced.

The Examiner stated that the claimed invention "does not specify 'a program *already* recorded.'" (Official Action at 2 (emphasis in original)). Referring to each of independent claims 52, 58, 63 and 72, the claims explicitly recite a "program recorded" on a recording medium "loaded in said external reproducing apparatus." It is clear from the plain language of the independent claims, without the addition of the word "already" as a modifier of the word "recorded," that the program is on, in other words, exists as a recording on, the recording medium when the recording medium is loaded in the external reproducing apparatus. The applied portions of Akamatsu concern display of information associated with a program(s) to be recorded (i.e., reservations). Akamatsu does not disclose showing on a display "information associated with

the program recorded on [,i.e., existing as a recording on,] the recording medium loaded in said reproducing apparatus by a predetermined format," as required by the claimed invention.

Sparks, like Akamatsu, does not disclose the claim feature of displaying information associated with the program already recorded on the recording medium.

Further, Akamatsu or Sparks, alone or in combination, do not disclose the limitation of determining whether a digital signal of the program recorded on the recording medium reproduced by the reproducing apparatus and received through the digital interface is decodable by the decoder of the receiving apparatus, as required by the claimed invention.

Hashimoto does not cure the deficiencies of Akamatsu or Sparks with respect to the requirements of the claimed invention. The applied portions of Hashimoto appear to concern adjustments on a video monitor for an input video signal, and displaying an error message if scanning frequencies of the input video signal are out of the adjustable range of the monitor or if no video signal is present. In contrast to the claimed invention, Hashimoto is not concerned with, and does not disclose, determining whether a reproduced digital signal of a program recorded on a recording medium "is decodable" at a receiving apparatus which receives the reproduced digital signal, and does not disclose notifying a user, with a message on a display, that the digital signal of the program recorded on the recording medium cannot be decoded. Combining Hashimoto with Akamatsu and Sparks would provide that the user is notified of whether adjustments at a video monitor can be made for a decoded input video signal or whether a decoded input video signal is present. Contrary to the Examiner's statement, the combination of Akamatsu, Sparks and Hashimoto would not provide a combination where the user is notified with a displayed message

indicating a determination that a decoder of the receiving apparatus cannot decode a digital signal of a properly recorded program on a recording medium, as required by the claimed invention, such that the user can take appropriate action.

Thus, Applicants request that the rejection of the pending claims be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he/she telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: February 12, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By Davy Zneraich  
Davy E. Zneraich

Registration No.: 37,267  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant